

## The Honorable Marsha J. Pechman

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE**

**STATE OF WASHINGTON, et al.,**

NO. 2:18-cv-00939-MJP

**Plaintiffs,**

## INITIAL JOINT STATUS REPORT

V.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA;  
DONALD TRUMP, in his official capacity as  
President of the United States of America,  
et al.,

#### Defendants.

## INTRODUCTION

Counsel for the State of Washington (on behalf of all Plaintiff States) and Counsel for Defendants conferred telephonically and via email on **July 23, 2018, July 25, 2018, and July 26, 2018** pursuant to the Court’s Order on Plaintiffs’ Motion for Expedited Discovery and Regular Status Conferences (Dkt. 32) (“Order”), and now together submit this Initial Joint Status Report and their respective positions on the issues the Court asked the parties to address concerning “the posture of the case as it currently stands,” “a prioritized list of discovery topics with a proposed timetable for completion,” and “an agenda of items for discussion at the initial conference.” Order at 10.

1      **1. Statement regarding the posture of the case as it currently stands.**

2           **Status of case:** The Plaintiff States filed this matter on June 26, 2018. They moved  
3 for expedited discovery and regular status conferences on July 2, 2018, which motion the  
4 Court granted in part on July 19, 2018. Defendants filed a motion to dismiss, transfer, or stay  
5 on July 11, 2018, which remains pending.

6           The States believe that this case is complex, but that the issues are primarily legal and  
7 that they can be presented for the Court's decision before the end of this year, after a brief  
8 period of expedited discovery. The States propose a period for expedited discovery ending in  
9 late September, followed by dispositive motions on a fall 2018 briefing schedule to be  
10 proposed by the parties for the Court's consideration.

11          The States note that the parties conferred by phone on Monday July 23, 2018, at  
12 which time the States requested information about the content of the *Ms. L* discovery and  
13 whether it would address their requests, as well as information about the *Ms. L* protective  
14 order. The States provided Defendants with a draft Joint Status Report with their position on  
15 the issues addressed below and their proposed set of discovery the next day. The parties  
16 again conferred on by phone on Wednesday, July 25, 2018, and the States provided  
17 Defendants with a revised Joint Status Report, including the specific information submitted  
18 by the States below regarding their discovery priorities and the narrowing efforts they  
19 undertook. The States note that Defendants did not provide them with any of the specific  
20 information included in their position statement in Section 2 ("prioritized list of discovery  
21 topics with a proposed timetable for completion") until shortly before 9:00 am on Thursday,  
22 July 26, 2018. At that time, the Defendants provided a draft of their position statement for  
23  
24

1       Section 2, without any of Defendants' cited materials in that section, including declarations  
2 and the Ms. L protective order. As a result, the States have been unable to evaluate the  
3 factual claims made by Defendants in Section 2. As of this filing, Defendants have not  
4 provided the requested information about the content of the Ms. L discovery or submitted a  
5 draft protective order for the States' review.

6       Defendants believe that there are dispositive issues involved in this case that are  
7 primarily legal but not particularly complex factually. Defendants intend to file a dispositive  
8 Rule 12 motion very soon. Regardless, Defendants believe this matter largely overlaps with  
9 *Ms. L. v. ICE*, No. 18-cv-428 (S.D. Cal.) and that the discovery the Plaintiffs envision will  
10 substantially detract from the federal government's compliance efforts in that case.  
11 Defendants consequently sought Plaintiffs' agreement to stay this litigation for the next two  
12 weeks to allow the Government to prioritize reunification efforts, but that Plaintiffs oppose  
13 that request.

14       Defendants also note that they did not receive any of Plaintiffs documents until 11:42  
15 PM Eastern time on Tuesday, July 24, and thus have had very little time to confer with the  
16 relevant agency personnel—who are expending their resources complying with deadlines in  
17 the *Ms. L* litigation—including conferring on the proposed scope and burden of Plaintiffs  
18 requests for immediate discovery. The parties in fact conferred concerning when the  
19 Government would be able to provide Plaintiffs with their portions of this pleading, and  
20 Defendants have provided Plaintiffs with as much information as they could promptly,  
21 including laying out their position by phone on the proper scope of discovery and the burdens  
22 the relevant agencies were enduring during compliance with *Ms. L*'s injunction that further  
23

discovery here would impact. Defendants proposed jointly asking the Court for a few more hours to file this document so that Plaintiffs could have more time to review the factual representation of Defendants but they declined to join such a motion. Defendants certainly would not oppose a delay in proceedings to provide Plaintiffs with any time they believe they need to review Defendants positions further.

**2. Prioritized list of discovery topics with a proposed timetable for completion:**

**Plaintiffs' Position**

Plaintiffs propose the following expedited discovery plan:

- A. The parties telephonically conferred on July 23, 2018 regarding the Court's order allowing expedited discovery, and again on July 25 and July 26, 2018.
- B. The States request leave to serve Defendants with immediate written discovery regarding 1) persons subjected to family separation and the progress of reunification efforts; 2) the justification for the family separation policy and directives regarding it to those Defendant employees charged with implementation, oversight and/or tracking the individuals affected by it; 3) the justification for a family detention policy and the implementation of same; and 4) directives to Defendant employees at Southwestern border ports of entry to turn away or "meter" asylum applicants, and documents reflecting Defendants' knowledge of this practice. The Plaintiff States' proposed First Set of Requests for Expedited Discovery, which was provided to Defendants' counsel on July 24, 2018, is attached as **Exhibit A**.

1 By its Order on Motion for Expedited Discovery and Regular Status  
2 Conferences, Dkt. No. 32 at 9-10, the Court directed the States to prioritize the  
3 discovery topics listed in Appendix A of the States' Motion. Accordingly, as  
4 reflected in their First Set of Requests for Expedited Discovery, the States have  
5 prioritized and limited their discovery requests by:

- 6 • Limiting discovery requests to twelve Requests for Production under  
7 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 34, and deferring the issuance of  
8 Interrogatories, Requests for Admission, and notices or subpoenas for  
9 deposition under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 30, 33, 36 and 45.
- 10 • Prioritizing documents containing up-to-date information about  
11 separated parents and children, including their locations, well-being, and  
12 Defendants' efforts to reunite them. (Exhibit A, RFP Nos. 1-3, 7).
- 13 • Seeking to minimize the burden to Defendants by allowing them to  
14 respond to seven out of the twelve proposed Requests for Production by  
15 producing the same materials already produced in *Ms. L*, provided that  
16 those materials provide the information sought by the States, including  
17 information about the separated children whose rights are not  
18 represented directly in *Ms. L*. (Exhibit A, RFP Nos. 1-7). (At the time of  
19 the parties' conference on June 23, 2018, counsel for Defendants did not  
20 yet have information about the content of documents already provided to  
21 the *Ms. L* plaintiffs.)

- 1           • Prioritizing discovery on the States' claims that are not being litigated in
- 2                 the *Ms. L* action. (Appendix A, RFP Nos. 8-12).
- 3           • Limiting the Requests for Production to documents concerning official
- 4                 justifications and implementation directives for the family separation
- 5                 and family detention policies, or components thereof, and deferring any
- 6                 broader "all documents" requests or requests for information specific to
- 7                 the history or development of those policies. (Exhibit A, RFP Nos. 4, 5,
- 8                 9, 11).

9           C. The States propose that the responses to their First Set of Requests for  
10           Expedited Discovery be due on August 3, 2018. Assuming that Defendants are  
11           able to produce complete responsive materials at that time, the States will  
12           confer with Defendants and determine what, if any, additional written discovery  
13           is necessary and confer regarding a schedule for all other discovery, if  
14           necessary.

15           D. The States recognize Defendants' desire to reduce the burdens of discovery and,  
16           consistent with the Court's Order on Motion for Expedited Discovery and  
17           Regular Status Conferences, have proposed the following additional measures  
18           to ameliorate those burdens:

- 20           • Production to the States of the materials that have been/will be produced  
21                 in the matter of *Ms. L., et al. v. ICE, et al.*, Case No. 18cv-0428 DMS  
22                 (MDD) (S.D. Cal.). The States understand that this material will

1 address, at least in part, their requests for information regarding  
2 separated family members and the reunification process;

- 3
- 4 • The States requested on July 23, 2018 a form of stipulated protective  
order from Defendants to address any privacy concerns related to  
5 production of the *Ms. L* material;
  - 6 • The States intend to offer Defendants stipulations that would obviate the  
need for discovery into discrete topics, for example, a stipulation that  
7 parents separated from their children after entering along the  
8 Southwestern border were not provided a hearing on parental  
9 fitness/best interests of the child prior to separation;
  - 10 • The States propose reducing the number of depositions in this case to 5  
11 per side, absent agreement of the parties or further order of the Court.

12

13

14 **Defendants' Position**

15 Defendants reiterate their position that any discovery in this case is inappropriate while  
16 their motion to transfer or dismiss based on comity considerations, Dkt. 22, remains pending.  
17 That motion raises threshold justiciability issues, as well as principles of comity that this Court  
18 should resolve prior to the commencement of any discovery. Furthermore, Defendants have  
19 asked Plaintiffs for a stay of this litigation for two weeks while reunification efforts are still  
20 ongoing in *Ms. L*. and Defendants' intent to file a formal Rule 12 Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs'  
21 claims in the near future. This should provide even more reason to refrain from discovery,  
22 expedited or otherwise, in whole or in part until the motions are resolved.

As an initial matter, a crucial threshold determination that must be determined is the States' standing in this case. Case law is clear that States have no legally protected interest in avoiding the incidental effects of the federal government's actions affecting individuals subjected to federal regulation who may eventually arrive in that State or who are in federal custody within the State's boundaries. *See, e.g., Massachusetts v. Mellon*, 262 U.S. 447, 485–86 (1923) (“[I]t is no part of [a State's] duty or power to enforce [its citizens'] rights in respect of their relations with the federal government. In that field it is the United States, and not the state, which represents them as *parens patriae*.”). Nor can the States rely on the legal rights or interests of third parties they allege are impacted by Defendants' enforcement actions, none of whom the States have alleged a close relationship with to support third-party standing. *See, e.g., Voigt v. Savell*, 70 F.3d 1552, 1565 (9th Cir. 1995). The mere fact that an individual *might* be housed within a State's territory does not somehow create a close relationship where those individuals are subject to *federal* custody and control. *See* 6 U.S.C. §§ 279, 1232(d)(5). Nonetheless, even if the States had standing based on their asserted interests in licensing out-of-home facilities or policies on family unity, which they do not, they have no basis to assert any due process rights of individuals, and they have no cause of action under the APA or INA to challenge the specific policies and practices at issue here. *Sure-Tan, Inc. v. NLRB*, 467 U.S. 883, 897 (1984) (third parties have “no judicially cognizable interest in procuring enforcement of the immigration laws” affecting someone else); *Ctr. for Law & Educ. v. Dep't of Educ.*, 396 F.3d 1152, 1157 (D.C. Cir. 2005) (APA zone of interests test requires plaintiff to show that “the [actions] in question are *designed* to protect [or regulate] some . . . concrete interest of *his* that is the ultimate basis of his standing”). The law is clear that detention and removal of aliens

1 taken into federal custody is exclusively a federal function. *See Arizona v. United States*, 132  
 2 S. Ct. 2492, 2498 (2012); *cf. In re Tarble*, 80 U.S. 397, 407-08 (1871).

3 Although Plaintiffs have represented that the basis for their expedited discovery is the  
 4 need to “obtain and preserve evidence,” Dkt 15-1, as to their claims because of the risk that  
 5 such evidence may no longer be present if they must wait until normal discovery processes  
 6 begin, they now seek discovery far broader in scope than anything that can be justified on the  
 7 basis of an emergent need to obtain and preserve evidence. Defendants dispute that Plaintiffs  
 8 have met their high burden of demonstrating any “legitimate[] fear[] that information” concerning  
 9 any of the challenged practices in this case or the location of relevant individuals “faces imminent  
 10 destruction.” *Music Grp. Macao Commercial Offshore Ltd. v. John Does I-IX*, No. 14-CV-621  
 11 RSM, 2014 WL 11010724, at \*2 (W.D. Wash. July 18, 2014). The United States is fully  
 12 complying with its preservation obligations in connection with this and other related  
 13 litigations, and whatever concerns Plaintiffs may have about spoliation is purely speculative,  
 14 and is generally of minimal relevance in litigation involving governmental entities. But even  
 15 assuming they had, the Plaintiffs’ envisioned expedited discovery is even more inappropriate  
 16 given their failure to “prioritize[]” any of their topics, Order at 9, or “narrowly tailor[]” them to  
 17 the circumstances this Court found to justify expedited discovery. *Music Grp.*, 2014 WL  
 18 11010724 at \*2. As explained below, such broad discovery, unmoored from the professed  
 19 exigency, fails that standard, and more importantly “prejudice[s] the responding party”  
 20 significantly by interposing Plaintiffs in this case between the parties in *Ms. L.*, who are  
 21 actively engaged in compliance with a court order designed to reunite the parents and children  
 22 the Plaintiffs in this case profess to likewise seek to reunite. *Id.*

In addition, as this Court has noted, the topics for which Plaintiffs seek expedited discovery “do not appear to have equal weight when it comes to the necessity for a swift response in the discovery process.” Dkt 27 at 9. Although the Court ordered Plaintiffs to prioritize those topics, *see id.*, they still have not shared with Defendants their proposed prioritization of expedited-discovery topics. Instead, they have sent Defendants twelve proposed Requests for Production, with multiple subparts to several requests, many of which are new and broader than what they proposed in Appendix A, which they indicate are *all* a priority, and with an identical proposed deadline of just one week. And while their proposed requests appear to mostly mirror Appendix A, some are new and Plaintiffs have failed to provide any discernible indication of priority within these requests. Without any of the prioritization of discovery categories that this Court ordered, Defendants instead offer their views on the appropriate prioritization:

A. Plaintiffs’ requests encompass several categories of information. The first is for documents that have been provided to class counsel in the *Ms. L.* matter. If any expedited discovery is to be granted, it should be limited to this information, although there is no suggestion these documents are in any risk of being destroyed or moved and Defendants are undertaking preservation efforts. In any event, the Plaintiffs should first be obligated to request this information from the *Ms. L.* class counsel. Since *Ms. L.* class counsel is certified to represent the class on a nationwide basis, and the information being provided to them is highly sensitive personal identifying information about their class members and their children, consent from the *Ms. L.* class counsel should be obtained by Plaintiffs here before that information is provided to them. The Plaintiffs seemingly do not care about this concern.

The Plaintiffs allege that they are acting in the interest of the individuals represented by the *Ms. L.* class counsel and that plaintiff class's their children. But it is not clear how they can properly claim to represent those interests when class counsel has been appointed, on a nationwide basis, by another court. The duties of class counsel include both "loyalty and confidentiality" to all class members, *Andrews Farms v. Calcot, LTD.*, No. 07-cv-0464, 2010 WL 3341963, at \*8 (E.D. Cal. Aug. 23, 2010), and "fiduciary duties," *Gilmore v. California*, No. 66-cv-45878, 2007 WL 2127843, at \*1 (N.D. Cal. July 25, 2007), among others. These are duties that the Plaintiffs' counsel here categorically lack with respect to the *Ms. L.* parents and children whose interests they ostensibly seek to represent. And there are sure to be a number of conflicts presented by the Plaintiffs purporting to act on behalf of the certified class—for example, the Plaintiff States have an obligation and duty to enforce their own state (or District) laws, and enforcement of those laws may present conflicts between the Plaintiffs and their purported actions on behalf of the class. Providing personal *Ms. L.* class-member information to the Plaintiffs here runs headlong into those conflicts. Indeed, to take but one example, the lead Plaintiffs' Attorney General's responsibility is to enforce the laws of Washington State, not to represent individuals. The Washington Attorney General is thus not well-suited, nor even authorized by statute to represent the interests of parents and children and to track down parents and children for reunification. In fact, his office explicitly disclaims any authority to represent the interests of "private citizens on personal legal matters," *see What the Attorney General's Office DOES NOT do*, <https://www.atg.wa.gov/roles-office>, which reunification with one's child undoubtedly is, and would be unable as an ethical or legal matter to serve as class counsel on behalf of the parents and children in *Ms. L.*, for whom that case's class

1 counsel has been working diligently to reunify in line with Judge Sabraw's order. Defendants  
 2 believe similar limitations and conflicts would also be presented by the other State Plaintiffs.  
 3

4 The sensitive personal information concerning class members is protected by statute or  
 5 regulation. *See, e.g.*, 8 C.F.R. §§ 208.6(a), 1208.6(a) (prohibiting the federal government, in  
 6 multiple contexts, from disclosing records pertaining to aliens' asylum applications, credible-  
 7 fear determinations, or reasonable-fear determinations); *see also Owino v. Holder*, 771 F.3d  
 8 527, 535–36, 539 (9th Cir. 2014) (per curiam) (noting how the federal government should not  
 9 breach an alien's personal "right to confidentiality"). For example, the sensitive information at  
 10 issue here could tend to reveal whether individuals have claimed a credible fear of persecution  
 11 or applied for asylum—but this information is protected from disclosure by federal regulations.  
 12

*See id.*

13 In somewhat similar circumstances, immigration advocates and the federal government  
 14 strongly resisted a sanctions order that would have required the federal government provide a  
 15 "list [of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrival recipients that] ... should include all personal  
 16 identifiers and locators including names, addresses, "A" file numbers and all available contact  
 17 information." *See Texas v. United States*, 2016 WL 3211803, at \*12 (S.D. Tex. May 19,  
 18 2016). That information would have been held under seal, but be made available to "Plaintiff  
 19 State[s] .... [upon] a showing of good cause." *Id.* The federal government then sought  
 20 mandamus relief from that order, explaining how "the production of sensitive personally  
 21 identifying information for approximately 50,000 individuals for the purpose of potential  
 22 further transmission to plaintiffs [States] would ... undermine the confidence of individuals in  
 23 the preservation of confidential information submitted to [the federal government] for specified  
 24

1 purposes, and, if dissemination is permitted, expose these individuals to an irremediable  
 2 invasion of their privacy.” *See In re United States*, No. 16-40795, United States’ Petition for a  
 3 Writ of Mandamus, (5th Cir. June 3, 2016) Fifth Circuit Mandamus Petition, at 30,  
 4 <https://www.nilc.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/TX-v-US-Govt-Mandamus-Petition-2016-06.pdf>. As a result, the district court stayed, and then withdrew, its previous order requiring  
 5 that personally identifying information in DHS files be provided to the plaintiff States. *See*  
 6 *Texas v. United States*, No. 14-cv-254, Order, Dkt. 434 (S.D. Tex. Jan. 19, 2017) (concluding  
 7 that there was “no current need for the [federal government] to file with the Court the  
 8 personnel identifiers”).

9  
 10 It is also protected by a protective order entered into in *Ms. L.* The protective order in  
 11 that case, attached hereto as Exhibit B, specifies who may be provided with confidential,  
 12 protected material. Notably, the *Ms. L.* class counsel and the federal government agreed that  
 13 individuals and organizations who were designated for the purpose of facilitating reunification  
 14 may have access to the protected material. The Plaintiffs here have not been so designated, and  
 15 their efforts before this Court—including this expansive expedited discovery request in the  
 16 midst of the reunification efforts—appear to be aimed at complicating and slowing down that  
 17 process, rather than serving the people on whose behalf they purport to be acting.  
 18

19 Moreover, the information shared with class counsel in *Ms. L.* was created for the  
 20 purpose of complying with the preliminary injunction in that case—a function that is being  
 21 ably administered by Judge Sabraw. It is unclear what the Plaintiffs would be doing with the  
 22 information in this litigation—they have not sought to participate in the reunification efforts in  
 23 the Southern District of California. Indeed, if the Plaintiffs’ claims were valid, they would be  
 24

1 subject to mandatory joinder in *Ms. L.* because the States “claim[] an interest relating to the  
 2 subject of the action and ... disposing of the action in the person’s absence may ... as a practical  
 3 matter impair or impede the person’s ability to protect the interest” and would certainly “leave  
 4 an existing party”—the United States as well as the *Ms. L.* plaintiffs—“subject to a substantial  
 5 risk of incurring double, multiple, or otherwise inconsistent obligations because of the  
 6 interest.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 19(b)(1). Indeed, if they were truly interested in pursuing these claims  
 7 on the merits, it is unusual that they would pick a forum new to the issues, rather than a forum  
 8 (located in one of the Plaintiff States, no less) that has already carefully considered the issues  
 9 for a period of months, addressed the legal claims in denying in part a motion to dismiss,  
 10 certified a class of the people the Plaintiffs purport to represent, held that they are likely to  
 11 succeed on the merits of some of their claims, and is busy administering a comprehensive  
 12 remedy that the Plaintiffs claim to be seeking in this Court.

13 What is most outrageous about Plaintiffs’ expedited discovery requests is its timing—in  
 14 the midst of Judge Sabraw’s rapid management of the reunification process. If Plaintiffs were  
 15 truly interested in the reunification of families, they would let Judge Sabraw finish the job.  
 16 Instead, they propose that Defendants respond to their proposed discovery requests within *one*  
 17 *week*—a week in which some of the most important reunification work in *Ms. L.* will be taking  
 18 place. Information exchanges between the federal government and the *Ms. L.* class counsel  
 19 during that period will be critical to the determination of class membership, the reunification of  
 20 class members who were removed, and the handling class members recently reunified and in  
 21 detention with final orders of removal. Declaration of David W. Jennings at ¶¶ 7, 9–11.  
 22 Expedited discovery in this case on that time frame—conducted outside of the able supervision  
 23  
 24

1 of Judge Sabraw—would work to detract from the virtually night and day work that the  
 2 agencies are doing, under the supervision of Judge Sabraw, to reunify families. The Plaintiffs  
 3 completely disregard this effort in seeking expansive discovery in the midst of this multi-  
 4 agency effort to implement Judge Sabraw's order that provides relief to the group the States  
 5 purport to represent.

6       2. Under no circumstances should expedited discovery be granted that goes  
 7 beyond the information being provided in the *Ms. L.* class action.

8       Although Plaintiffs represent that they have attempted to narrow their requests by  
 9 asking for the information provided in *Ms. L.*, it is clear that they intend their responses to be  
 10 read to encompass far more information than what has been provided in *Ms. L.* Indeed, in  
 11 several instances their requests read “to the extent such documents are not already identified  
 12 and produced” where the first of their twelve requests seeks all the information provided in *Ms.*  
 13 *L.* Everything else is in addition to that. And contrary to the claim they need this real-time,  
 14 current information to avoid spoliation, Plaintiffs request information dating back to the  
 15 beginning of the year, in formats that the federal government does not maintain when  
 16 implementing Judge Sabraw's orders in *Ms. L.* or administering the Unaccompanied Alien  
 17 Children program in the ordinary course. *See Declaration of Jonathan White at ¶¶ 5–6.*  
 18 *Moreover, Plaintiffs seek such information for parents and children who have already been*  
 19 *reunified.* Plaintiffs cannot possibly vindicate the interests of parents and children who have  
 20 already received the relief the parents sought in court—and if the parents were to seek  
 21 additional relief, it should come that request should come from the certified class, not Plaintiff  
 22 States. Requiring Defendants to provide customized reporting on parents, children, and  
 23

reunifications to the Plaintiffs—especially for parents and children who have already been reunified, let alone by month, facility, and state going back to January 1, 2018—would be unduly burdensome to all agencies involved, is not needed on an expedited basis, and would seriously impede the agencies’ ability to complete the remaining reunifications quickly. *See id.* at ¶¶ 29–30; Jennings Declaration, at ¶ 23.

Given the time constraints implicit in any expedited discovery situation, and particularly the instant situation where the important work of reunification is ongoing, Defendants submit that the information already provided to class counsel in *Ms. L.* would be the least burdensome information to produce to Plaintiffs. And, of course, any production should be conditioned upon the entry of an appropriate protective order, but Defendants are confident that one can be negotiated and entered into expeditiously. Indeed, it is the only practical solution in the time frame Plaintiffs have proposed for expedited discovery. Most importantly, the production of the information from *Ms. L.*, along with the production of the blank forms presently used by the agencies for reunification, is the only expedited discovery that can be produced without an adverse impact on the ongoing *Ms. L.* reunification and compliance. And production should only happen with the consent and approval of *Ms. L.* class counsel. Thus, Defendants request that the Court limit the entry of expedited discovery to this material, upon consent of the *Ms. L.* class counsel.<sup>1</sup>

B. A second category of information the Plaintiffs seek includes both aggregated and individualized information spanning each and every separated child and parent, including

---

<sup>1</sup> Indeed, with respect to two related cases, including another class action, involving the children whose interests the States purport to represent, *N.T.C. v. ICE*, No. 18-cv-6428, 2018 WL 3472544 (S.D.N.Y. July 19, 2018), *E.S.R.B. v. Sessions*, No. 18-cv-6654, slip op. (S.D.N.Y. July 24, 2018), both judges, with the parties’ consent consulted with Judge Sabraw in order to ensure coordination in light of these issues. *See Dkt. 35 at 2-3.*

1 the total number, location, conditions of release, DHS' reunification plan, and the current  
 2 location of every separated parent and child, dating back to the beginning of the year. Again,  
 3 there no suggestion, and no showing has been made, that such information is at any risk of  
 4 being destroyed or moved, and that is especially so here where litigation holds have been  
 5 issued to relevant agencies concerning those very documents. Moreover, much of that  
 6 information duplicates the information provided in *Ms. L.*, and requiring a separate production  
 7 of these categories of material would require extensive work by the same information experts  
 8 and personnel who are critical to the *Ms. L.* reporting and reunification efforts.

9 Such discovery presents an overwhelming burden because, to the extent it goes beyond  
 10 the information being produced in *Ms. L.*, it can only be done with a manual search of records.  
 11 HHS has estimated that it would take more than 2,000 hours to generate the kind of  
 12 information sought by Plaintiffs. *See* White Declaration, at ¶ 16. The necessity of manual  
 13 searches requiring many thousands of man hours to respond to the proposed discovery is a  
 14 reality for each of the agencies at issue. For example, ICE cannot run a search for "conditions  
 15 of release" for a category of individuals. Therefore, to provide such information would require  
 16 a painstaking, individual, case by case review. *See* Jennings Declaration, at ¶¶ 11, 15.  
 17 Furthermore, because the information is not kept in the kind of format sought by Plaintiffs, it  
 18 would require the agencies to create a spreadsheet or database to produce this information for  
 19 hundreds of children and families, adding to the burdensome nature of the request. *See id.* at ¶¶  
 20 12–13.  
 21

22 In addition, some of the information sought is simply not available to the agencies. For  
 23 example, ICE may not know the current location of aliens who have been released. *See id.* at  
 24

¶ 15. To the extent ICE has any information, it may simply be the last known address, and  
 1 would again involve manual records review of individual files to produce this information. *Id.*  
 2 And all of HHS's resources, including their "surge" capacity, have been deployed to devote to  
 3 ensuring compliance in the *Ms. L.* case. Simply put "HHS does not have additional 'surge'  
 4 resources or personnel available to deploy in order to fulfill expedited discovery requests," to  
 5 the extent it is not what has already been generated by *Ms. L.* See White Declaration at ¶ 13.  
 6 Thus, to require HHS and ORR to provide information pursuant to such request would be  
 7 extremely burdensome and counterproductive to the reunification of children and parents as is  
 8 mandated by *Ms. L.* See *id.*; see also *Ms. L.*, Transcript of Proceedings, at 35 (S.D. Cal. July  
 9 24, 2018) (noting how HHS's efforts to accomplish reunification with their "surge" personnel  
 10 thus far have been a "remarkable achievement").

The third category of information pertains to documents, directives, and forms.  
 12 Specifically, Plaintiffs request directives regarding the "treatment" of separated children,  
 13 documents regarding the "justification" for vetting sponsors, prerequisites to reunification, the  
 14 rollout of family separation, the justification for the use of a certain form, hearings on parental  
 15 fitness, the alleged refusal to permit asylum seekers to present themselves at ports of entry,  
 16 family detention, and the DHS "Northern Border Strategy." There is no need for expedited  
 17 discovery on these matters. This information presents no risk that "the evidence sought may be  
 18 moved or become difficult to track as time goes on." Order, Dkt. 27 at 5. Policies, directives,  
 19 forms, and other documents, even if they may change, are not at risk of being destroyed or  
 20 moved, and that is especially so here where the agencies are undertaking efforts to preserve  
 21 those very documents. Importantly, to divert agency resources towards burdensome discovery  
 22  
 23  
 24

of non-exigent matters at this time would seriously impair the critical work being done at multiple agencies to accomplish the relief that Plaintiffs allegedly seek—to reunify families.

As we have explained, it makes no sense that if the goal of this suit is the reunification of families, that Plaintiffs reject pursuing their claims and seeking discovery before the *Ms. L.* court, which could efficiently manage both the claims in this lawsuit as well as ensure these claims and discovery requests would not impair the relief being granted and implemented to the certified class in *Ms. L.*

### **C. Proposed Agenda for Initial Status Conference:**

#### **Plaintiffs' Position**

A. The Plaintiff States propose that the initial status conference address the States' proposed expedited discovery and the timing for responses to same, the States' request for the additional orders noted below, and the schedule for status conferences going forward.

B. The States seek an order permitting them to serve their initial discovery on July 27, 2018, following the status conference and in compliance with any orders issued by the Court during the conference.

C. The States further request that the Court enter an order allowing for telephonic hearing attendance by Plaintiff States other than Washington; provided that the State of Washington will attend all hearings in person and is authorized to act on behalf of the Plaintiff States at such hearings.

1                   Defendants' Position

2                   Defendants propose addressing the following items at the July 27, 2018 status  
3 conference:

- 4                   • Developments in *Ms. L.* concerning compliance with that court's injunction, ongoing  
5                   efforts to reunify children with parents, and overlap between that case and this one.
- 6                   • The potential impact of parallel proceedings and discovery in this case on ongoing  
7                   efforts to reunify families in *Ms. L.*
- 8                   • The impact on *Ms. L.* and this case of the recent decisions by two district courts in  
9                   New York to transfer a putative class action and a related case concerning children  
10                  seeking reunification with their parents to the Southern District of California. *See*  
11                  *N.T.C. v. ICE*, No. 18-cv-6428, 2018 WL 3472544 (S.D.N.Y. July 19, 2018) (Dkt.  
12                  33-1) and *E.S.R.B. v. Sessions*, No. 18-cv-6654, slip op. (S.D.N.Y. July 24, 2018).
- 13                  • An expedited briefing schedule for the Defendants' impending Rule 12 motion to  
14                  dismiss.
- 15                  • The Defendants' pending transfer motion.
- 16                  • The Defendants' request to stay this litigation to allow for *Ms. L.* compliance efforts  
17                  to be prioritized.
- 18                  • Scheduling of subsequent status conferences in this case.
- 19                  • Coordination between this Court and Judge Sabraw in the Southern District of  
20                  California in the event parallel discovery proceeds. As Judges Furman and Rakoff did  
21                  with the parties consent in *N.T.C.* and *E.S.R.B.*, Defendants believe it may be  
22                  worthwhile for this Court to confer with Judge Sabraw concerning any overlap with  
23
- 24

1           the *Ms. L.* litigation and ongoing compliance with the injunction in that case and  
2           would not object to that occurring. Defendants have conferred with Plaintiffs'  
3           counsel, who indicate they "have no objection to the Court managing its caseload and  
4           docket as it deems appropriate" in this case.

5           DATED this 26th day of July, 2018.

6

7           \_\_\_\_\_  
*/s/ Laura K. Clinton*

8           LAURA K. CLINTON, WSBA #29846  
9           Assistant Attorney General  
10          NOAH G. PURCELL, WSBA #43492  
11          Solicitor General  
12          COLLEEN M. MELODY, WSBA #42275  
13          Civil Rights Division Chief  
14          REBECCA GLASGOW, WSBA #32886  
15          Deputy Solicitor General  
16          MEGAN D. LIN, WSBA #53716  
17          Assistant Attorney General  
18          Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Washington

19           \_\_\_\_\_  
*/s/ Joshua Press*

20          CHAD READLER  
21          Acting Assistant Attorney General  
22          AUGUST E. FLENTJE  
23          Special Counsel to the Assistant Attorney  
24          General  
25          WILLIAM C. PEACHEY  
26          Director  
27          EREZ REUVENI  
28          Assistant Director  
29          JOSHUA S. PRESS  
30          NICOLE MURLEY  
31          Trial Attorneys  
32          Attorneys for Defendants

# Exhibit A

## The Honorable Marsha J. Pechman

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE**

STATE OF WASHINGTON, et al.,

NO. 2:18-cv-00939-MJP

Plaintiffs,

**PLAINTIFF STATES' FIRST SET OF  
DISCOVERY REQUESTS FOR  
EXPEDITED DISCOVERY**

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA;  
DONALD TRUMP, in his official capacity as  
President of the United States of America,  
et al.,

Defendants.

TO: THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; DONALD TRUMP, in his official capacity as President of the United States of America; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY; U.S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT; U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION; U.S. CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION SERVICES; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES; OFFICE OF REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT; KIRSTJEN NIELSEN, in her official capacity as Secretary of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security; THOMAS HOMAN, in his

1 official capacity as Acting Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs  
2 Enforcement; KEVIN K. MCALEENAN, in his official capacity as  
3 Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection; ALEX AZAR, in his  
4 official capacity as Secretary of U.S. Department of Health and Human Services;  
5 SCOTT LLOYD, in his official capacity as Director of Office of Refugee  
6 Resettlement; and JEFFERSON BEAUREGARD SESSIONS III, in his official  
7 capacity as the Attorney General of the United States, Defendants;

8 AND TO: JOSHUA S. PRESS, Attorney for Defendants.

## 9 I. INSTRUCTIONS

10 Pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 26 and 34, Plaintiffs hereby request that  
11 Defendants produce the following documents and electronically stored information for  
12 inspection and copying within the time ordered by the Court to the office of Laura K. Clinton,  
13 Assistant Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General, 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000,  
14 Seattle, Washington 98104-3811, or at such other place as the parties shall mutually agree.  
15 Electronic documents may be produced in PDF format or as a printed record.

16 For each document that you assert is privileged or otherwise excludable from discovery,  
17 please provide the following information: the author(s), the recipient(s), all copy recipients, the  
18 date, the type of document (memorandum, e-mail, letter, chart, photograph, etc.), a description  
19 of the document, the privilege being claimed, and the grounds for the privilege claim.

21 If any request for production seeks information in any document formerly in your  
22 possession, custody, or control that has been discarded, misplaced, lost, destroyed, or otherwise  
23 placed outside your custody or control, identify the document and describe its contents in detail  
24 and state when the document was discarded, misplaced, lost, destroyed, or otherwise placed

outside your custody or control. If the document was destroyed, identify each person with knowledge of its destruction, the person requesting or performing the destruction, the reasons for its destruction, and each document that refers or relates to either the existence or destruction of the document. For each document that was discarded, misplaced, lost, or otherwise placed outside your custody or control, explain all circumstances in relation to the loss of the document and identify each person with knowledge regarding those circumstances.

If you object to producing documents in response to any request for production, state your objection and all factual and legal bases for the objection.

These discovery requests are continuing in nature. If you discover additional or different information that is responsive to these discovery requests, you are required to provide supplemental responses in accordance with Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 26(e). If you do not provide the required supplemental information, the Plaintiffs may move at the time of trial to exclude from evidence any requested information and documents that were not timely furnished.

The singular shall include the plural and vice versa, and the conjunctive shall include the disjunctive and vice versa. Wherever used, references to the masculine, feminine, or neuter gender shall include the neuter, feminine, and masculine genders, as the context demands.

## II. DEFINITIONS

The following definitions apply to following discovery requests:

The term "document" encompasses the broadest possible definition permitted under the Rules and specifically includes all written or recorded material of any kind or character in your possession, custody, or control or within your knowledge, including without limitation statements, letters, correspondence, telegrams, memoranda, notes, records, reports, studies, interoffice communications, calendar and diary entries, microfilm, bulletins, circulars,

1 pamphlets, messages, invoices, maps, charts, tabulations, summaries or abstracts, video or audio  
2 recordings, work sheets, surveys, graphs, statistics, tables, photographs, rules, regulations,  
3 opinions, orders, interpretations, guidelines, electronic mail, any data or information stored or  
4 saved on any computer hard disk, floppy disk, tape, or other medium, any computer print-outs,  
5 computer software or code, whether in machine or human readable form on any medium, and all  
6 other documentary material, including non-identical copies (whether different from the original  
7 because of any alterations, notes, comments, or other material contained thereon or attached  
8 thereto or otherwise and whether a draft or final version).

9       The term “communication” means any transmission, disclosure or exchange of  
10 information or opinion, however made.

11       The term “concerning or relating to” means referring to, evidencing, containing,  
12 discussing, mentioning, describing, reflecting, summarizing, constituting, identifying,  
13 memorializing, referring or pertaining to, studying, commenting or reporting on, or analyzing,  
14 in whole or in part

15       A “person” means any individual, corporation, partnership, association, or any other  
16 entity of any kind.

17       “You” and “your” mean any Defendants and any person acting or purporting to act on  
18 behalf of any of them, including without limitation all present and former employees, agents,  
19 representatives, personnel, attorneys, accountants, consultants, experts, investigators, or other  
20 persons.

22       “Separated Child” or “Separated Children” mean any child under the age of 18 who  
23 entered the United States along the U.S.-Mexico border at or between designated ports of entry  
24 with a parent or guardian, and who was separated from that parent or adult guardian by the

1 Department of Homeland Security (DHS) or any other Defendant without a determination that  
 2 the parent or adult guardian is unfit or presents a danger to the child.

3 “Separated Parent” means any parent or guardian who entered the United States along  
 4 the U.S.-Mexico border at or between designated ports of entry with a child under the age of 18,  
 5 and who was separated from that child by DHS or any other Defendants without a determination  
 6 that the parent or adult guardian is unfit or presents a danger to the child.

7 The “*Ms. L Case*” refers the matter *Ms. L., et al. v. U.S. Immigration and Customs*  
 8 *Enforcement, et al.*, Case No. 18-cv-0428 DMS (MDD) (S.D. Cal.).

### 9 III. REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION

10 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 1:** All documents provided to Plaintiffs’ counsel  
 11 or the court in the *Ms. L Case* concerning the separation of families and Defendants’ attempts to  
 12 reunite them. For future productions of materials in the *Ms. L Case*, please produce such materials  
 13 concurrently with, or within two business days after, production in *Ms. L*.

15 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 2:** To the extent such documents are not already  
 16 included and produced in response to Request for Production No. 1, documents sufficient to  
 17 identify:

- 19     a) The number and location of Separated Children placed by the Office of Refugee  
 Resettlement (ORR) - or any other Defendant - in each Plaintiff State from  
 January 1, 2018 to the present.
- 21     b) The number and location of Separated Parents who are or were detained in each  
 Plaintiff State from January 1, 2018 to the present, by month and facility.
- 23     c) The number and location of Separated Parents in each Plaintiff State released  
 from DHS custody from January 1, 2018 to the present, including the facility  
 from which they were released, the conditions of release, and current location.

- 1           d) As to every Separated Parent who is present in any Plaintiff State (or who was  
2           present in a Plaintiff State on the day this lawsuit was filed) the location of that  
3           Parent's children and DHS' plan to reunify the Separated Parent with the child.  
4  
5           e) As to every Separated Child who is present in any Plaintiff State (or who was  
6           present in a Plaintiff State on the day this lawsuit was filed), the current placement  
7           and location of every such child (e.g., living with a sponsor in Seattle,  
8           Washington), the location of that Separated Child's Separated Parent(s), and  
9           DHS' plan to reunify the Separated Child with the Separated Parent(s).

6           **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 3:** To the extent such documents are not already  
7           included and produced in response to RFP No. 1, documents regarding Defendants' efforts to  
8           reunify families separated at the Southwestern border, including  
9

- 10          a) Directives regarding the treatment of Separated Children as Unaccompanied Minors  
11          as a matter of policy, and application of ORR's Unaccompanied Minor reunification  
12          policies to separated families;  
13  
14          b) Documents concerning the justification and implementation directives for vetting  
15          "sponsors" of separated parents and/or children, including treating parents as  
16          sponsors unrelated to their children;  
17  
18          c) Documents concerning financial and procedural prerequisites to reunification  
19          including the justification and implementation directives for requiring Separated  
20          Parents to comply with any financial or administrative requirements prior to  
21          reunifying them with their children, including paying for costs of reunification or  
22          submitting to fingerprinting;  
23  
24          d) Documents sufficient to identify the number of Separated Parents who have been  
25          deported by Defendants without their children since January 1, 2018.

19           **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 4:** To the extent such documents are not already  
20           included and produced in response to RFP No. 1, documents regarding the rollout and  
21           implementation of the family separation policy at the Southwestern border, including documents  
22           concerning the justification for such policy and directives to those who were charged with  
23           implementing, overseeing, and tracking the individuals affected by the policy.  
24

1                   **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 5:** To the extent such documents are not already  
2 included and produced in response to RFP No. 1, documents concerning the justification for and  
3 implementation of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement’s “Separated Parent’s Removal  
4 Form,” Dkt. 27-1, Exhibit W, including the number of Separated Parents provided with such  
5 form, the number of Separated Parents who signed such form, and the number of Separated  
6 Parents who were deported after signing such form.

7  
8  
9                   **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 6:** To the extent such documents are not already  
10 included and produced in response to RFP No. 1, documents concerning whether hearings on  
11 parental fitness were provided to Separated Parents prior to Defendants separating them from their  
12 children.

13  
14                   **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 7:** To the extent such documents are not already  
15 included and produced in response to RFP No. 1, documents sufficient to ascertain the number of  
16 Separated Parents against whom an allegation of unfitness has been made, the number of such  
17 Parents found to be unfit after judicial hearing, the number of child trafficking prosecutions or other  
18 felony criminal charges brought against such parents in 2018, and the number of such prosecutions  
19 that resulted in conviction.

20  
21  
22                   **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 8:** Documents reflecting Defendants’ knowledge  
23 of the practice of refusing to permit persons who seek asylum to present themselves at valid ports  
24 of entry along the U.S.-Mexico border, including discussion of “metering”, numerical or space

1 limits on asylum claims, administrative or other limits on asylum claim processing, or requiring  
 2 asylum seekers to return to ports of entry at a later day or time, including any directives to  
 3 Defendants' employees at the Southwestern border concerning same.

4

5       **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 9:** Documents concerning Defendants' pilot  
 6 program separating families in the El Paso sector of the U.S.-Mexico border was alleged in  
 7 paragraphs 45- 46 and 120 of the Complaint (Dkt. 1), including directives to Defendant  
 8 employees charged with implementing and monitoring such program.

9

10      **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 10:** Documents concerning the implementation  
 11 of a family detention policy, including information regarding potential sites within the Plaintiff  
 12 States for family detention centers and any proposed or enacted regulatory changes related to  
 13 family detention.

14

15      **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 11:** Documents concerning implementation of  
 16 Defendants' "Northern Border Strategy" as alleged in paragraph 136 of the Complaint (Dkt. 1).

17

18      **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 12:** Documents, including medical studies,  
 19 concerning any negative effects on psychological, emotional, and physical health, that family  
 20 separation might have on Separated Children or Separated Parents.

DATED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of July, 2018.

NOAH G. PURCELL, WSBA #43492  
Solicitor General  
COLLEEN M. MELODY, WSBA #42275  
Civil Rights Division Chief  
LAURA K. CLINTON, WSBA #29846  
MEGAN D. LIN, WSBA #53716  
Assistant Attorneys General  
Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Washington

### CERTIFICATION

The undersigned attorney certifies that he/she has read each response and objection to these discovery requests, and that to the best of his/her knowledge, information, and belief, formed after a reasonable inquiry, each is: (1) consistent with the Rules and warranted by existing law or a good faith argument for the extension, modification, or reversal of existing law; (2) not interposed for any improper purpose, such as to harass or to cause unnecessary delay or needless increase in the costs of litigation; and (3) not unreasonable or unduly burdensome or expensive, given the needs of the case, the discovery already had in the case, the amount in controversy, and the importance of the issues at stake in the litigation.

DATED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20178

ATTORNEY NAME, WSBA #  
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

## VERIFICATION

STATE OF WASHINGTON )  
 ) ss.  
County of )

I, \_\_\_\_\_, being first duly sworn, upon oath, state as follows:

That I am a Defendant authorized to sign these Answers and Responses to the Plaintiffs' First Set of Discovery Requests for Expedited Discovery; that I have read the foregoing Interrogatories and Requests for Production and the Answers and Responses thereto, know the contents thereof, and swear that the foregoing are true and correct.

DATED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2018.

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Defendant

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN to before me this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2018.

---

**NOTARY SIGNATURE**

**NOTARY PRINTED NAME**  
Notary Public  
State of Washington  
My Commission Expires: \_\_\_\_\_

# Exhibit B

1 CHAD A. READLER  
2 Acting Assistant Attorney General  
3 WILLIAM C. PEACHEY  
4 Director  
5 WILLIAM C. SILVIS  
6 Assistant Director  
7 SARAH B. FABIAN  
8 Senior Litigation Counsel  
9 NICOLE N. MURLEY  
10 Trial Attorney  
11 U.S. Department of Justice  
12 Office of Immigration Litigation  
13 District Court Section  
14 Box 868, Ben Franklin Station  
15 Washington, DC 20442  
16 Telephone: (202) 616-047  
17 Fax: (202) 616-8962  
18 *Attorneys for Federal Respondents*

ADAM L. BRAVERMAN  
Acting United States Attorney  
SAMUEL W. BETTWY  
Assistant U.S. Attorney  
California Bar No. 94918  
CAROLINE J. PRIME  
Assistant U.S. Attorney  
California Bar No. 220000  
Assistant U.S. Attorney  
Office of the U.S. Attorney  
880 Front Street, Room 6293  
San Diego, CA 92101-8893

*Attorneys for Federal Respondents- Defendants*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MS. L., et al., )  
Plaintiffs/Petitioners ) Case No.: 3:18-cv-00428-DMS  
v. )  
U.S. IMMIGRATION AND )  
CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT, et al., )  
Respondents/Defendants. )

**STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] PROTECTIVE ORDER GOVERNING  
THE HANDLING OF CONFIDENTIAL MATERIAL**

1       I. Plaintiffs and Defendants (collective, the “Parties”) in the above  
2 captioned action *Ms. L., et al., v. U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, et*  
3 *al.*, Case No. 3:18-cv-00428-DMS (“Litigation” or “Action”) recognize that  
4 information about putative or confirmed class members and their children  
5 exchanged by the Parties in the Litigation for the purpose of facilitating compliance  
6 with the Court’s preliminary injunction order may include private information  
7 related to individuals in the custody and care of the United States Government and  
8 that such materials may reasonably, in good faith, be confidential and protected  
9 from disclosure to the public or to one or more of the Parties under Rule 26(c) of  
10 the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.  
11

12     II. The Parties desire to enter into this stipulation to facilitate the  
13 exchange of documents and information while protecting against the unauthorized  
14 disclosure of confidential documents and information.  
15

16     IV. The Parties believe good cause exists for approving the stipulation  
17 because it seeks to protect against injury caused by the dissemination of protected  
18 materials. The materials to be protected include personally identifiable information,  
19 the disclosure of which could be prohibited by the Privacy Act or other law.  
20 However, the Privacy Act provides, as an exception, that such materials may be  
21 released “pursuant to the order of a court of competent jurisdiction.” 5 U.S.C. §  
22 552a(b)(11). An order of this Court, therefore, would provide a basis for release of  
23 the requested materials pursuant to the Privacy Act and Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c). The  
24 parties also seek to protect other personal information regarding putative or  
25 confirmed class members or their children.  
26

### Stipulation

27     NOW, THEREFORE, the Parties stipulate and agree, through their  
28 undersigned counsel, to the following terms and conditions to govern the

1 production of information that the producing party reasonably and in good faith  
 2 deems confidential, and request that the Court enter a protective order (hereafter  
 3 “Protective Order” or “Order”) consistent with the terms of this stipulation.

4       **1. Scope.** The following terms govern with respect to class information  
 5 exchanged by the Parties in the Litigation for the purpose of facilitating compliance  
 6 with the Court’s preliminary injunction order (collectively “Protected Material”).

7       **2. Protected Material.** The categories of Protected Material include:

8           **a.** Information, documents or tangible things protected by the  
 9 Privacy Act, 5 U.S.C. § 552a, *et seq.*, or information that would be covered by the  
 10 Privacy Act if the subject of the information had been a U.S. citizen or a person  
 11 lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

12          **b.** Personally Identifying Information (PII), Protected Health  
 13 Information (PHI), and any information that is protected or restricted from  
 14 disclosure by statute or regulation.

15          **c.** All other protected documents, information or tangible things  
 16 not identified above that the parties agree in writing or the Court orders qualify for  
 17 protection under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c).

18          **d.** Defendants do not waive their right to assert other or further  
 19 privileges over the information and redact such information. For instance,  
 20 Defendants may withhold or redact information that is protected by statute for  
 21 which no exceptions permitting disclosure apply or exist or information that is  
 22 subject to a claim of privilege or exemption from disclosure such as withholding  
 23 classified national security information the Deliberative Process Privilege, Law  
 24 Enforcement Privilege, Attorney-Client Privilege or Attorney Work Product.

25       **3. Designations.** It shall be the duty of the party producing the Protected  
 26 Material (“Producing Party”) to give notice of material that is to be considered  
 27 covered by this Protective Order in the manner set forth in paragraphs 5, 8 and 11  
 28 below. Protected Material may be designated as “PROTECTED MATERIAL” if

1 the Producing Party believes in good faith that such material is covered by this  
2 Protective Order. A Party may designate material that it obtained from a Third  
3 Party pursuant to this Protective Order, if it believes in good faith that it qualifies as  
4 Protected Material under this Order.

5       **4. Duties.** The duty of the Party or Parties receiving the Protected  
6 Material (“Receiving Party”) and of all other persons bound by this Protective  
7 Order to maintain the confidentiality of Protected Material so designated shall  
8 commence with such notice. Protected Material shall be designated by the  
9 Producing Party, subject to the provisions of this Order, with the designation of  
10 “PROTECTED MATERIAL.” No person subject to this Protective Order may  
11 disclose, in public or private, any Protected Material designated by a Party as  
12 “PROTECTED MATERIAL,” except as provided for in this Protective Order or as  
13 further ordered by the Court.

14       **5. Method Of Designation.** Each page of any material the Producing  
15 Party wishes to designate as Protected Material must be labeled PROTECTED  
16 MATERIAL, at the time the material, or a copy thereof, is provided to the  
17 Receiving Party. In the case of material contained in or on media other than paper,  
18 the Producing Party shall affix such a label to the material or use its best efforts to  
19 identify the material as Protected Material and affix the applicable designation.

20       **6. Access To Protected Material.** Only the following persons shall have  
21 access to or retain material designated as PROTECTED MATERIAL pursuant to  
22 this Order:

- 23           **a.** The Court and its official personnel;
- 24           **b.** Counsel for any Party and any of Defendants’ personnel with  
25 whom Counsel for Defendants determines it is appropriate to share such  
26 information for the purpose of this litigation. For the purposes of this Protective  
27 Order, “Counsel” means the attorneys representing the Parties for this Action,

28

1 including paralegals, office clerks, secretaries, and other support staff assisting  
2 those attorneys, working on the Action;

3           **c.** For information designated as PROTECTED MATERIAL  
4 relating to an individual member of the class, to the individual class member and  
5 counsel who represent individual class members, or any prospective counsel that is  
6 evaluating whether to take on the representation of a class member. The individual  
7 class member and counsel shall only be provided PROTECTED MATERIAL  
8 relating to the individual class member, and the individual may not be provided any  
9 information pertaining to other class members. Prospective counsel must execute  
10 Exhibit A, the Acknowledgment Regarding the Order before receiving this limited  
11 PROTECTED MATERIAL;

12           **d.** Outside experts, consultants retained by the Receiving Party's  
13 Counsel to assist in this Litigation (and the experts' or consultants' staff whose  
14 duties and responsibilities require access to such materials);

15           **e.** Court reporters and translators;

16           **f.** Outside litigation support personnel retained by Counsel to  
17 assist in the preparation and/or litigation of the Action, including contract attorneys  
18 or outside copying service vendors or electronic document management vendors;

19           **g.** Any person not otherwise covered by subparagraph (a), (b), (c),  
20 or (d) who was involved in the preparation of such material or who received or  
21 reviewed such material for purposes other than this Action or who has been alleged  
22 to have received or reviewed such material for purposes other than this Action;

23           **h.** Witnesses at deposition not otherwise covered by subparagraphs  
24 (a), (b), (c) or (d);

25           **i.** Persons whom the Producing Party agrees in writing or on the  
26 record at a deposition may be shown PROTECTED MATERIAL.

27           **j.** Any individuals or persons who Class Counsel designates for  
28 the purpose of facilitating the reunification of Class Members and their children,

1 including (but not limited to) nonprofit organizations, lawyers, faith-based groups,  
 2 shelters, or any other organization or individuals who may be able to assist in the  
 3 reunification process. Given the urgency of the deadlines in the Court's preliminary  
 4 injunction order, the individuals or persons described in this paragraph may receive  
 5 a limited set of PROTECTED MATERIAL as follows prior to executing Exhibit A,  
 6 the Acknowledgment, as long as the information is treated as protected under this  
 7 Order, and an Acknowledgment is signed within a reasonable time thereafter.  
 8 Information which may be shared for the purpose of facilitating the reunification of  
 9 Class Members and their children includes Class Members' names and the name(s)  
 10 of the class member's child(ren); Alien Number for the Class Member and his or  
 11 her child(ren); detention location or other location information regarding the Class  
 12 Member and his or her child(ren). The individuals or persons described in this  
 13 paragraph may receive any additional PROTECTED MATERIAL necessary to  
 14 assist in facilitating reunification related to the class member(s) they are serving or  
 15 being consulted to serve after signing the Acknowledgment. The individual or  
 16 organization may not receive information about any other class members.

17       **7. Agreement By Persons Accessing Protected Materials.** All persons  
 18 identified in paragraph 6 (d), (e), (f), (g), (h) (i), and (j) who in the course of the  
 19 case may be given access to Protected Material shall be required to read this  
 20 Protective Order and agree, in writing, to be bound by this Protective Order by  
 21 executing an acknowledgment in the form of Exhibit A that is annexed to this  
 22 Protective Order. All such acknowledgments shall be maintained in the files of the  
 23 counsel allowing access by such person to the Protected Material.

24       **8. Treatment Of Protected Material During Inspection Of**  
 25 **Documents.** It is contemplated that a Party might make available certain of its files  
 26 for inspection by other Parties, which files may contain protected material as well  
 27 as non-protected material, and that following such inspection, the inspecting party  
 28 will designate documents to be copied and the copies will be furnished or produced

1 to it. All documents and their contents made available for such inspection shall be  
2 treated as PROTECTED MATERIAL until the Party allowing inspection has had a  
3 reasonable opportunity, not to exceed twenty one (21) calendar days absent an  
4 agreement by the parties, to designate and mark those documents which were  
5 copied as PROTECTED MATERIAL.

6       **9. Copies, Summarizations, Extracts Protected.** Protected Material  
7 designated under this Order shall include, without limitation: (a) all copies, extracts,  
8 and complete or partial summaries prepared from such documents, things, or  
9 information so designated; (b) portions of deposition transcripts and exhibits to  
10 deposition transcripts that contain, summarize, or reflect the content of any such  
11 documents, things, or information; and (c) portions of briefs, memoranda, or any  
12 other writings filed with the Court and exhibits thereto that contain, summarize, or  
13 reflect the content of any such documents, things, or information. The Parties agree  
14 that information regarding the aggregated numbers for any category of individuals  
15 contained in the chart may be excluded from this paragraph. Moreover, a Party may  
16 make a request to the producing Party that certain material contained in such  
17 copies, extracts, and complete or partial summaries not be treated as PROTECTED  
18 MATERIAL. The Parties will meet and confer in good faith within five days of any  
19 such request to resolve the request.

20       **10. Pleadings And Briefs Containing Protected Material.** Before any  
21 materials produced in discovery, answers to interrogatories, responses to requests  
22 for admissions, deposition transcripts, or other documents which are designated as  
23 confidential information are filed with the Court for any purpose, the party seeking  
24 to file such material must seek permission of the Court to file the material under  
25 seal, unless the Parties agree that the documents can be redacted to remove the  
26 Protected Material. The receiving party shall meet and confer with the producing  
27 party regarding any proposed redactions before seeking leave from the Court, and  
28

1 the producing party shall not unreasonably withhold its consent to the filing of a  
2 redacted copy of the Protected Material.

3       **11. Court Hearings And Other Proceedings.** Nothing contained in this  
4 Protective Order shall be construed to prejudice any Party's right to use before the  
5 Court any Protected Material. Before doing so, however, and to the extent not  
6 otherwise authorized to be so used hereunder, the Party intending to use Protected  
7 Material shall so inform the Court and the Producing Party, so that any Party or  
8 Third Party may apply to the Court for appropriate protection, including clearing  
9 the hearing room or courtroom of persons not entitled to receive Protected Material  
10 pursuant to paragraph 6.

11       **12. Testimony At Pretrial Court Hearings And Other Proceedings.**  
12 All testimony elicited during hearings and other proceedings that counsel for a  
13 Party or Third Party indicated on the record may be subject to the protections of this  
14 Order shall be deemed PROTECTED MATERIAL until the expiration of twenty  
15 one (21) calendar days after delivery of a copy of the transcript of the testimony by  
16 the court reporter to counsel who requested a copy of the transcript. Within the  
17 twenty one (21) calendar day period following such mailing of the transcript, any  
18 Party may move to seal the transcript under LRCiv 79-5, designating all or any  
19 portion of the testimony as PROTECTED MATERIAL. Upon being informed that  
20 certain portions of a transcript are designated as PROTECTED MATERIAL, each  
21 Party must have each copy in their custody, possession or control immediately  
22 marked with the appropriate designation at the appropriate pages. Such designation  
23 must remain until the Court rules on the motion to seal.

24       **13. This Order Only Applies To The Exchange of Information About  
25 Putative or Confirmed Class Members and Their Children For The Purpose  
26 Of Facilitating Compliance With The Court's Preliminary Injunction Order.**  
27 Nothing contained in this Order shall restrict or limit any Party's right to present  
28

1 Protected Material to the Court during a trial in the Action. The use of Protected  
 2 Material at trial shall be governed by the pretrial order.

3       **14. This Order Does Not Apply To Non-Private Information.** The  
 4 restrictions set forth in this Protective Order shall not apply to documents, things, or  
 5 information that: (a) have been publicly disclosed by either Party; or (b) have been  
 6 independently obtained by the Receiving Party through lawful means. If the  
 7 Producing Party challenges the Receiving Party's invocation of this provision, then  
 8 the Receiving Party shall provide written documentation showing the material falls  
 9 within categories of non-private information referenced in this provision. This  
 10 paragraph does not purport to waive or in any other way limit any protection that  
 11 exists under law, including the Privacy Act, 5 U.S.C. § 552a, *et seq.*

12       **15. Challenge To Designations.** If a Party may objects to a designation  
 13 of the materials as Protected Material on the ground that such protection is not  
 14 warranted under controlling law, the following procedure shall be used: The Party  
 15 objecting to the designation of Protected Material must notify, in writing, counsel  
 16 for the other Party of the objected-to materials and the grounds for the objection.  
 17 The writing shall be by email to all counsel for the other Party, followed by a hard  
 18 copy sent next business day courier. The objecting Party shall request to meet and  
 19 confer with the other Party prior to submitting the dispute to the Court for a ruling.  
 20 If the dispute is not resolved consensually between the parties within ten (10)  
 21 business days of receipt of such a notice of objections, the objecting party may  
 22 move the Court for a ruling on the objection. The materials at issue must be treated  
 23 as Protected Material, until the Court has ruled on the objection or the matter has  
 24 been otherwise resolved.

25       **16. No Waiver By Failure To Challenge Designation.** For purposes of  
 26 the Action or any other action, no Party concedes that any material designated as  
 27 PROTECTED MATERIAL does in fact contain or reflect Protected Material. A  
 28 Party shall not be obligated to challenge the propriety of the designation of

1 Protected Material at the time made, and failure to do so shall not preclude a  
2 subsequent challenge.

3       **17. Inadvertent Disclosure Of Protected Material.** The failure by a  
4 Producing Party to designate specific documents or materials as Protected Material  
5 shall not, by itself, be deemed a waiver in whole or in part of a claim of  
6 confidentiality as to such documents or materials. Upon written notice to the  
7 Receiving Party of such failure to designate, or of incorrect designation, the  
8 Receiving Party shall cooperate to retrieve disseminated copies, and restore the  
9 confidentiality of the inadvertently disclosed information beyond those persons  
10 authorized to review such information pursuant to paragraph 6, and shall thereafter  
11 take reasonable steps to ensure that the Protected Material is treated in accordance  
12 with the designation. No person or Party shall incur any liability under this  
13 Protective Order with respect to disclosure that occurred prior to the receipt of  
14 written notice of the mistaken designation.

15       **18. Disclosure To Producing Party's Personnel.** Nothing in this  
16 Protective Order shall affect the right of the Producing Party to disclose to its client  
17 agency personnel, employees, consultants, or experts, any documents, things, or  
18 information designated by it as Protected Material pursuant to this Order; such  
19 disclosure shall not waive the protection of this Protective Order and shall not entitle  
20 other Parties or their attorneys to disclose such information, documents, things, or  
21 information in violation of this Order.

22       **19. Disclosure To Unauthorized Persons.** If information subject to this  
23 Protective Order is disclosed to any unauthorized person either through  
24 inadvertence, mistake, or otherwise without authorization by the Producing Party,  
25 or other than in the manner authorized by this Protective Order, the person  
26 responsible for the disclosure shall immediately (a) inform the Producing Party of  
27 all pertinent facts relating to such disclosure, including without limitation, the  
28 name, address, and telephone number of the recipient and his or her employer;

1       (b) use his or her best efforts to retrieve the disclosed information and all copies  
 2 thereof; (c) advise the recipient of the improperly disclosed information, in writing,  
 3 of the terms of this Protective Order; (d) make his or her best efforts to require the  
 4 recipient to execute an agreement to be bound by the terms of this Protective Order  
 5 in the form of the declaration attached to this Protective Order as Exhibit A; and  
 6 (e) take all other reasonable steps to prevent further disclosure by or to the  
 7 unauthorized person who received the Protected Material.

8       **20. “Admissibility” Of Protected Material.** This Protective Order shall  
 9 not constitute a waiver of any Party’s or non-party’s right to object to the  
 10 admissibility into evidence of any Protected Material under Federal law.

11       **21. All Objections Preserved.** This Protective Order is intended to  
 12 provide a mechanism for handling the disclosure or production of Protected  
 13 Material to which there is no objection other than confidentiality. The protection  
 14 afforded by this Order shall in no way affect a Producing Party’s right to withhold  
 15 or redact documents as: (a) privileged under the attorney-client or other privilege,  
 16 (b) protected by the work product doctrine, or (c) otherwise exempted from  
 17 discovery under Rule 26 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or under any law.  
 18 Additionally, this Protective Order shall not prejudice the right of a Party to:  
 19 (a) seek additional protective treatment for any information it considers to be very  
 20 highly sensitive, or otherwise exempt from disclosure, such that the protections in  
 21 this Protective Order would be insufficient, (b) object to the designation of any  
 22 document or information as PROTECTED MATERIAL, or (c) seek any  
 23 modification of or relief from any provision of this Protective Order, either  
 24 generally or as to any particular Protected Material, by properly noticed motion  
 25 with notice to all Parties and their respective counsel.

26       **22. Advice To Client.** Nothing in this Protective Order shall prevent or  
 27 otherwise restrict counsel from rendering legal advice to the clients in this  
 28 Litigation and, in the course of this Litigation, relying generally on examination of

1 designated p Protected Material; provided, however, that in rendering such advice  
2 and otherwise communicating with such client, counsel shall not disclose the  
3 specific contents of Protected Materials to persons not authorized to receive such  
4 material pursuant to the Protective Order.

5 **23. Inadvertent Disclosure Of Privileged Information.**

6           **a.**       The inadvertent disclosure of Material covered by the attorney-  
7 client privilege, the work-product doctrine, or any other recognized privilege shall  
8 be governed by Federal Rule of Evidence 502 and this Protective Order.

9           **b.**       If, in connection with the pending Litigation, a Producing Party  
10 inadvertently discloses information subject to a claim of a privilege or protection  
11 described in paragraph 26(a) (“Inadvertently Disclosed Information”), such  
12 disclosure shall not constitute or be deemed a waiver or forfeiture of any claim of  
13 privilege or work-product protection that the Producing Party would otherwise be  
14 entitled to assert with respect to the Inadvertently Disclosed Information and its  
15 subject matter.

16           **c.**       If a claim of inadvertent disclosure is made by a Producing Party  
17 with respect to Inadvertently Disclosed Information, the Receiving Party shall,  
18 within five (5) business days, return or destroy all copies of the Inadvertently  
19 Disclosed Information and provide a certification of counsel that all such  
20 Inadvertently Disclosed Information has been returned or destroyed.

21           **d.**       Within twenty-one (21) calendar days of the notification that  
22 such Inadvertently Disclosed Information has been returned or destroyed, or within  
23 a different time upon written agreement of the Parties or order of the Court, the  
24 Producing Party shall produce a privilege log with respect to the Inadvertently  
25 Disclosed Information.

26           **e.**       Nothing in this Protective Order shall limit the right of any Party  
27 to petition the Court for an order compelling production of such Inadvertently  
28

1 Disclosed Information, or for an in-camera review of the Inadvertently Disclosed  
2 Information.

3       **24. Good Faith Designations.** Each Party agrees that designation of  
4 Protected Material and responses to requests to permit further disclosure of  
5 Protected Material shall be made in good faith and not: (a) to impose burden or  
6 delay on an opposing Party, or (b) for tactical or other advantage in litigation.  
7 Further, each Party agrees to make best efforts to avoid as much as possible  
8 inclusion of Protected Material in briefs and other captioned documents filed in  
9 court, in order to minimize sealing and designating such documents as Protected  
10 Material.

11       **25. Use Of Information Subject To Protective Order.** The Receiving  
12 Party's use of any information or documents obtained from the Producing Party  
13 subject to this Protective Order, including all information derived therefrom, shall  
14 be restricted to use in this Litigation (subject to the applicable rules of evidence and  
15 subject to the confidentiality of such materials being maintained) and shall not be  
16 used by anyone subject to the terms of this agreement, for any purpose outside of  
17 this Litigation or any other proceeding between the Parties, except as otherwise  
18 provided in this Order.

19       **26. Meet And Confer.** Prior to filing any motion or application before the  
20 Court to enforce this Protective Order, the moving party shall notify the other  
21 Party(ies) in writing and meet and confer in good faith in an attempt to resolve their  
22 dispute(s).

23       **27. Injunctive Relief.** In the event anyone violates or threatens to violate  
24 any of the terms of this Protective Order, the Parties and Third Parties agree that the  
25 aggrieved party may, subject to the "meet and confer" requirement set forth above,  
26 apply to the Court to obtain injunctive relief against any such person violating or  
27 threatening to violate any of the terms of this Protective Order. In the event the  
28 aggrieved party brings such motion or application, the responding person subject to

1 the provisions of this Protective Order shall not employ as a defense the claim that  
2 the aggrieved party possesses an adequate remedy at law. The Parties and Third  
3 Parties shall not use or reveal, directly or indirectly, any information in violation of  
4 this Protective Order. Because of the confidential and proprietary nature of the  
5 information contemplated to be covered by this Protective Order, the Parties and  
6 Third Parties' agree that legal remedies are inadequate. Therefore, the Parties and  
7 Third Parties stipulate that injunctive relief is an appropriate remedy to prevent any  
8 person from using or disclosing Protected Material in violation of this Protective  
9 Order. The Parties and Third Parties waive and release any and all requirements for  
10 a bond or undertaking to support any injunctive relief for enforcement of this  
11 Protective Order.

12       **28. Other Actions.** If any Party is (a) subpoenaed in another action,  
13 (b) served with a demand in another action to which it is a Party, or (c) served with  
14 any legal process by one not a party to this action, seeking information or material  
15 which was produced or designated as Protected Material by someone other than that  
16 Party, the Party shall give prompt actual written notice, by hand or facsimile  
17 transmission, within ten (10) calendar days of receipt of such subpoena, demand, or  
18 legal process, to those who produced the Protected Material prior to compliance  
19 with the subpoena so as to allow the Producing Party to seek protection from the  
20 relevant court(s). Nothing in this Protective Order shall be construed as requiring  
21 the Party or anyone else covered by this Protective Order to challenge or appeal any  
22 order requiring production of information or material covered by this Protective  
23 Order, or to subject itself to any penalties for noncompliance with any legal process  
24 or order, or to seek any relief from this Court.

25       **29. Survival And Final Disposition Of Designated Material.** Final  
26 termination of the Litigation, including exhaustion of appellate remedies, shall not  
27 terminate the limitations on use and disclosure imposed by the Protective Order.  
28

1                   **a.** Within sixty (60) days of the final termination of the Litigation  
2 by final judgment (whether by settlement, trial, or otherwise), including the time for  
3 filing and resolution of all appeals, or within such other period as the Parties may  
4 agree upon, all Protected Material and copies of Protected Material, including such  
5 material in the hands of outside experts or consultants or attorneys who considered  
6 or accepted representation of a class member or child, shall be delivered by counsel  
7 of record for the Receiving Party to counsel of record for the Producing Party of  
8 such material or destroyed, with confirmation of that destruction to the producing  
9 Party in writing.

10                  **b.** Any Protected Material filed or lodged with and retained by the  
11 Court shall not be subject to the provisions of this paragraph 32.

12                  **c.** Notwithstanding the foregoing, counsel may retain copies of  
13 briefs and other papers filed with the Court, deposition transcripts, discovery  
14 responses, and attorney work product that contains or constitutes Protected  
15 Material. Further, counsel are not required to delete information that may reside on  
16 their firm's electronic back-up systems that are over-written in the normal course of  
17 business. Any such archival copies that contain or constitute Protected Material  
18 remain subject to this Protective Order and shall be maintained in a safe and secure  
19 manner.

20                  **30. Amendment Or Termination Of Protective Order.** No part of the  
21 restrictions imposed by this Protective Order may be terminated, except by written  
22 stipulation executed by counsel of record for each Producing Party or by an Order  
23 of this Court for good cause shown. The terms of this Protective Order shall  
24 survive termination of the Action.

25                  **31. Jurisdiction For Enforcement.** The Court retains jurisdiction  
26 subsequent to settlement or entry of judgment to enforce the terms of this Protective  
27 Order. Each person to whom disclosure of any Protected Information is made  
28 agrees to subject himself to the jurisdiction of the Court in which this action is

1 pending for the purpose of proceedings relating to the performance under,  
2 compliance with, or violation of this Protective Order.

3       **32. Limitations.** Nothing in this Order shall be deemed to restrict in any  
4 manner the use by any party of its own documents or materials. Nothing in this  
5 Protective Order should be construed as prohibiting a non-party from seeking  
6 additional protections of records or information that it owns or controls.

7 || Dated: July 8, 2018

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION  
FOUNDATION  
IMMIGRANTS' RIGHTS PROJECT

/s/ Lee Gelernt

LEE GELERT

Email: LGELERT@aclu.org

## Counsel for Plaintiffs

5 || Dated: July 8, 2018

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF  
JUSTICE, OFFICE OF IMMIGRATION  
LITIGATION

/S/ *Sarah B. Fabian*

SARAH B. FABIAN

Email: Sarah.B.Fabian@usdoj.gov

## Counsel for Defendants

[CONTINUED ON THE NEXT PAGE]

## ORDER

For good cause shown, pursuant to Rule 26(c) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, all discovery and other materials exchanged by the Parties or Third Parties, or filed with the Court, in *Ms. L, et al., v. U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement et al.*, 3:18-cv-00428 (S.D. Cal.) shall be provided subject to the conditions set forth in the foregoing Stipulated Protective Order. This order shall be construed as a lawful order pursuant to the Privacy Act permitting release consistent with the terms of this Order.

## **IT IS SO ORDERED**

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**Hon. Dana M. Sabraw  
United States District Judge**

## **STIPULATION EXHIBIT A**

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENT AND AGREEMENT CONCERNING PROTECTED INFORMATION**

1. My name is \_\_\_\_\_ (first, middle initial, last).

**2.** I live at \_\_\_\_\_ (street address),  
\_\_\_\_\_ (city), \_\_\_\_\_ (state) \_\_\_\_\_ (zip  
code).

3. I am employed as a/an \_\_\_\_\_ by \_\_\_\_\_ (company), which is located at \_\_\_\_\_ (street address), \_\_\_\_\_ (city), \_\_\_\_\_ (state) \_\_\_\_\_ (zip code). Its telephone number is \_\_\_\_\_.

I have read the attached Stipulated Protective Order entered in the action of *Ms. L. et al. v. U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement et al.*, pending in the Southern District of California and bearing Case No. 3:18-cv-00428, and a copy of the Stipulated Protective Order has been given to me.

**4.** I agree to be bound by the terms of the Stipulated Protective Order, and agree that any Protected Material, within the meaning of the Stipulated Protective Order, will be used by me only to assist counsel in connection with the above-referenced litigation or as otherwise authorized by the Stipulated Protective Order.

5. I agree that I will not disclose or discuss Protected Material so designated with anyone other than the persons described in paragraph 6 of the Stipulated Protective Order.

6. I understand that any disclosure or use of Protected Material in any manner contrary to the provisions of the Stipulated Protective Order may subject me to sanctions for contempt of the Court's Order.

7. I agree to be subject *in personam* to the jurisdiction of the Southern District of California in connection with any proceeding relating to the enforcement of the Stipulated Protective Order.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

(date)

(signature)